DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 794 RC 011 276

AUTHOR George, K. M.
TITLE A Profile of Agriculture Students at Murray State University.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.; Murray State Univ., Ky.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 37p.; Publication contributes to USDA Cooperative State Research Service Southern Regional Project S-114, "Defining and Achieving Life Goals: A Process of Human Resource Development" ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Agricultural Colleges; Agricultural Education; Aspiration; Attitudes; *Career Choice; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Educational Interest; Family Characteristics; Higher Education; *Land Grant Universities; Rural Population; *Southern States; *Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS Kentucky; *Murray State University KY; Southern Regional Research Project S 114

ABSTRACT

In 1978, 150 randomly selected agriculture students at Murray State University were surveyed to determine their general background characteristics, high school characteristics, work experiences, people and factors influential in their choice of a college major, goals and expectations, and selected agriculture related attitudes. The agriculture students' similarities and differences with counterparts at the 1862 land grant universities in the South were also determined. Over 95 percent of Murray State agriculture students were white and one in five was female. Murray students were more rural with 58 percent claiming farm or open country residence, a proportion twice as great as that of land grant schools. Slightly more than 60 percent of students in both groups mentioned parental influence in their choice of career major. Eighty-seven percent of the Murray students cited preference for country life as a reason for choosing the agriculture major. A higher proportion of Murray students (84 percent) depended on scholarships and student loans and grants as a source for financial support. This study is a part of the Southern Regional Research Project S-114, which seeks to obtain a better understanding of the reasons why students select agriculture as their major, as well as the factors relating to their career choices. Tabular data summarize the percentage responses of both study groups. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

rec 02-01-79

ED168794

A PROFILE OF AGRICULTURE STUDENTS AT MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. M. George

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Preliminary Report on Data from Southern Regional Research Project S-114*

*Southern Regional Research Project S-114: "Defining and Achieving Life Goals: A Process of Human Resource Development."

This report was prepared by K.M. George, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Murray State University.

RC 011225

LIST OF TABLES

1. General background characteristics of respondents.
2. High School background characteristics of respondents.
3. Agricultural and non-agricultural work experiences of respondents.
4. People deemed "very influential" or of "some influence" in helping respondent to choose his/her college major.
5. Things deemed "very important" or of "some importance" in choosing respondent's present major.
6. Membership in agriculture or home economics related organizations while at college.
7. Position as a leader or officer in agriculture or home economics related organizations while in college.
8. Sources of funds for college education.
9. Educational aspirations.
10. Educational expectations.
11. Occupational expectations.
12. Income expectation on respondents' first job.
13. Selected attitudes of respondents on Women's issues.
14. Selected attitudes of respondents on ecological issues.
15. Respondents' perception about the field of agriculture.
16. Respondents' perception about agriculture students.

A PROFILE OF AGRICULTURE STUDENTS AT MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Departments of agriculture in U.S. colleges and universities have been experiencing phenomenal growth in enrollment in recent years. A matter of considerable interest to the administrators and the faculty of agricultural schools, besides the sheer increase in enrollment, is the fact that the new agriculture students are in some significant ways different from agriculture students of the past. Increasingly, a much higher proportion of the new students are female and urban-born and they appear to be preparing themselves to enter into agriculture-related occupations rather than preparing themselves to enter into agriculture as a way of life.

The shift in the kind of students coming to the field of agriculture is bound to have important implications not only for the schools where they are to be trained but also for larger issues of manpower and food production. The farm population in the U.S. has been declining steadily in number since World War II. But our need or obligation to produce larger and larger amounts of food has not been declining but increasing all along. Therefore, the changes taking place in schools of agriculture are not only of significance to the school itself or the state in which the school is located but they are tied to the future well-being of the nation and the world.

In this changed context, it is a matter of theoretical and social policy relevance to know who are the new agriculture students, what are their characteristics, and what are their aspirations for the future. Further, the

training of agriculture students in the U.S. has been traditionally a responsibility of the land grant colleges. However, regional state universities and private institutions of higher education are also involved in providing agriculture-related education to their students. This shared responsibility of educating agriculture students may also have implications for the kind of students the two systems of instruction attract.

The purpose of this paper is to report in broad outline the findings of a study of agriculture students at Murray State University. This study was carried out as part of a larger research effort by the southern land grant institutions under the title "Southern Regional Research Project S-114" ("Defining and Achieving Life Goals: A Process of Human Resource Development"). The major objective of this research was to obtain a better understanding of the reasons why students select agriculture as their major as well as to study the factors related to their career choices. This report presents the results of that portion of the general survey which describe the characteristics of agriculture students at Murray State University. In addition, this report attemps to show some of the similarities and differences between agriculture students at Murray State University, a non-land grant regional state university, and their counterparts attending the 1862 land grant universities of the south*.

Data for this study were collected during the spring and summer of 1977 through a mailed questionnaire. The sample for the Murray State University agriculture students was drawn from a list of all students majoring in agriculture during the 1977 spring semester. To ensure a reasonable sample size, 150 students were randomly picked from the list. The sample for the land

*1862 Land grant Colleges: Arkansas, Auburn, Clemson, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas A&M, Texas Tech. Virginia.

grant institutions was drawn from similar lists of agriculture students in the different universities. From these lists a fifteen percent random sample was drawn. Two mail follow-ups and one direct contact were used to improve response rates. The overall response rate for agriculture students at Murray State University was 78 percent (N=117), a somewhat higher response rate than that for the land grant schools. The questionnaire contained a variety of questions related to the students' social background, educational experiences, and career orientations.

In this report comparisons are made between the Murray State sample and the 1862 land grant schools sample (N=2535). The areas of interest covered in this report are: 1) general background characteristics of the respondents; 2) high school characteristics; 3) work experiences; 4) people deemed influential in respondents' selection of his/her major; 5) things deemed important by the respondent in choosing his/her college major; 6) goals and expectations; and 7) selected agriculture-related attitudes of the respondent. Results are presented in percentage form.

General Background Characteristics (Table 1)

An examination of the general characteristics of the study population shows that Murray State University agriculture students, while sharing certain characteristics with their counterparts in the southern land grant institutions, differ from the latter significantly in a number of other characteristics. In racial composition and citizenship, Murray State University students are very similar to the students in the land grant schools. Over 95 percent of Murray State University agriculture students are white, and almost all of them

are citizens of the United States. The proportion of female students at Murray State University is about 10 percent lower than that of the land grant schools Only one in five Murray State University students is a female. Additionally, a higher proportion of Murray State University students are married, almost 10 percent more than agriculture students in the land grant universities.

Some significant differences exist between the two groups of students in their residence background and types of communities in which their parents were raised. Murray State University students and their parents are far more rural than their counterparts in the land grant universities. Farm or open country residence was claimed by approximately 58 percent of the Murray State University students, a proportion twice as great as that of the land grant schools. Equally significant is the fact that the number of Murray State University students whose parents were raised on the farm or in the open country was almost 20 percent greater than students in the land grant institutions. Murray State University students reported that well over 60 percent of their fathers and mothers were raised on a farm or in the open country. Current residence of parents of Murray State University students has remained more rural. Fifty-six percent of the parents of Murray State University students live on a farm compared with 24 percent of the parents of students attending land grant universities.

In terms of their parents' average yearly income and educational attainment, Murray State University students have a significantly greater representation at the lower ends of the scales than do their counterparts in the study population. About 18 percent of the Murray State University students report their parents' income to be below $10,000 per year, and the range of income of about 25 percent of this group is between $10,000 and $15,000 per year. Also, noteworthy is the fact that 29 percent of the fathers and 17 percent of the

mothers of Murray State University students have had less than 12 years of schooling.

Still another significant difference between Murray State University students and students at the land grant universities is their political orientation. The data show that Murray State University students are far less likely to claim a liberal political orientation than their counterparts at the land grant universities.

High School Background (Table 2)

Murray State University students shared with their counterparts in the land grant universities a number of characteristics with respect to secondary education. However, in some areas of interest, Murray State University students appear to vary from the students in the land grant schools. A much higher proportion of Murray State University students reported that the high schools from which they graduated offered courses in agriculture: twice as many Murray State University students as land grant school students reported taking these courses. Among the Murray State University students who said that their decision to major in agriculture was influenced by some course offered in high school, 86 percent said it was an agriculture course. A lower proportion of land grant university students were similarly influenced.

In general, participation rates in high school activities were similar for Murray State University students and their counterparts in the land grant institutions. However, in most categories of activities, Murray State University students had a slightly higher participation rate. The difference between the two groups of students is particularly noticeable in agriculture-related activity groups such as 4-H, FFA, FHA, and other vocational clubs.

Work Experience (Table 3)

The figures show that Murray State University had a significantly larger percentage of students reporting work experience on a farm; however, the proportion of Murray State University students reporting nonfarm work experience was slightly lower than that of the land grant schools. Seventy-four percent of the Murray State University agriculture majors stated that they worked on their parents' farm. A similar number also said that they worked as hired employees on other farms or ranches. Fewer than 50 percent of the land grant university students claimed farm work experience, either on a home farm or as a hired employee.

People Deemed Important in Influencing Choice of Major (Table 4)

Parents were most influential in the respondents' choosing agriculture as their major for both groups of students in this study. Slightly more than 60 percent of students in both study groups mentioned parents' influence. A higher percentage of Murray State University students, however, cited the influence of other individuals: vocational agriculture teacher (35 percent); county extension agent (19 percent); college teacher/advisor (44 percent); and former students (28 percent). Among other persons deemed influential by students in this survey were veterinarians, college friends, high school teachers, and high school friends.

Things Deemed Important in Choosing Major (Table 5)

The primary reason that both Murray State University students and the other students in the study chose their present major was to prepare for a

career. Over 90 percent of the respondents mentioned career preparation as "very important" or of "some importance." The second most important reason indicated by both groups of students was "preference for country life." Eighty-seven percent of Murray State University students checked this item whereas 77 percent of the land grant university students gave "preference for country life" as a reason for choosing this major. A much higher proportion of Murray State University students credited their successful experience in agriculture as "important" or "very important" in selecting agriculutre as their major. A desire to help others figured prominently in their decision to choose agriculture as a major both for Murray State University and the other students. The promise of a good income also played an important part in the students' choice of major. Sixty-six percent of Murray State University students and 58 percent of the other students checked "to insure good income" as a factor in their decision. Other factors, such as "My family thought it would be best," "had a course related to this in high school," and "had a course related to this in college" were listed by both groups of students as having some, but less, importance in their choice of major. Fifty-eight percent of the Murray State University students and 40 percent of the other students in the survey considered a factor or factors not listed in the questionnaire as "very important" in the choice of their present major.

Membership in College Organizations (Table 6)

An examination of the organizational membership of agriculture students indicates that individuals in both study populations participate in numerous college organizations. There is one significant difference in participation rates: a higher proportion of Murray State University students have membership

in agriculture-related organizations than do students from the other schools. Twenty-four percent of Murray State University students participate on judging teams compared to only 13 percent of the other students, and 17 percent of Murray State University students have membership in college 4-H, FFA, and FHA compared to only 9 percent of the students from land grant universities.

Sources of Funds for College Education (Table 8)

Students in the survey reported a number of sources of funding for their college education. The major sources of financial support cited by Murray State University students are their savings, summer jobs, parents' savings, and part-time work while in college, in that order. Students from the other institutions indicate parents' savings, summer jobs, their own savings, and part-time work in college, in that order, as the major sources of financial support. Interestingly, a higher proportion of Murray State University students depend on scholarships and student loans and grants for their education than do their counterparts in the other schools. Forty-two percent of Murray State University students list scholarships as a source of their funds. An equal proportion list student loans and grants as sources of their financial support for college education.

Goals and Aspirations

Educational goals are about the same for both groups of students in the study. A slightly higher proportion of Murray State University students wish to complete work for a master's degree than do students in the land grant schools. When asked how much education they expect to obtain, the response of

both groups of students suggests that they may, of necessity, have to settle for less than what they wish to have. Eight percent of the Murray State University students surveyed expect to discontinue their schooling before obtaining a bachelor's degree, and none expect to earn a doctoral degree. A higher proportion of Murray State University students expect to complete a master's degree than do students from the other schools. Thiry-five percent of Murray State University students expect a master's degree (Table 10), and 96 percent of them hope to do their graduate work in agriculture. Furthermore, over half of those planning on graduate work expect to remain at their present university to complete their studies.

Farming Plans and Residential Preference (Table 11)

Murray State University students who expect or foresee the possibility of inheriting a farm represent a somewhat higher proportion than their counterparts in the land grant institutions. About one-fourth of the sample expect to inherit a farm, and a slightly higher proportion foresee the possibility of inheriting one. More significant, however, is the difference between the two groups in their expectations to own a farm alone in the future. The percentage of Murray State University students expecting to "own a farm alone" is more than twice as great as that of the land grant university students. Seventy percent of the Murray State University students expect to own a farm alone.

Selected Attitudes

Respondents were given seven statements on women's issues in order to determine their views on that subject. The Murray State University portion of

the sample indicated that Murray State University students are somewhat more traditional in their views of the roles of women than are the other students in the study. The agreement score on whether most agricultural occupations are unsuited for women is about the same for both groups of students. On the question of whether women are just as capable as men at work outside the home, only 54 percent of Murray State University students expressed agreement with the statement whereas the corresponding score for the land grant university students was 61 percent.

The study groups in the survey share similar attitudes concerning ecological issues. Only a small proportion (15 percent) of Murray State University students feel that strip mining is more important to provide energy than keeping the countryside in its natural condition. The role of government in ecological issues is accepted by a much larger percentage of the students in the sample (Table 14).

The respondents' perception about the field of agriculture is a positive one. They believe that good career opportunities exist in agriculture and that agriculture is not a declining industry. They disagree that most work in agriculture can be done by people with very little education (Table 15).

Finally, Murray State University agriculture students perceive themselves as more sure of what they want in life than their counterparts in the land grant schools and all non-agricultural students. In addition, the view that agriculture students are more friendly and helpful to other people than non-agricultural students is shared by 67 percent of Murray State University students and 55 percent of the others in the study (Table 16).

Table 1. General background characteristics of respondents (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
1. Sex	N=2533	N=117
Male	72.8	80.3
Female	27.2	19.7
2. Racial/Ethnic identity	N=2519	N=116
White/Anglo	94.8	95.7
Other	5.2	4.3
3. Country of Citizenship	N=2526	N=117
USA	97.4	99.1
Other	2.6	.9
4. College Classification	N=2525	N=117
Freshman	18.2	26.5
Sophomore	21.5	14.5
Junior	26.5	21.4
Senior	31.5	28.2
Graduate/other	2.2	9.4
5. Marital Status	N=2516	N=116
Single	85.2	73.5
Married	13.5	23.1
Separated/Divorced	1.3	3.4
6. Place where respondent lived most of his/her life	N=2525	N=117
Farm/ranch	19.8	42.7
Open country	8.4	15.4
Small town	13.9	17.1
City, 10,000-49,999	20.9	13.7
Metro	37.2	11.1
7. Place where respondent's father was raised	N=2505	N=117
Farm/ranch	33.4	55.6
Open country	10.7	11.1
Small town	19.3	19.7
City, 10,000-49,999	14.3	9.4
Metro	22.3	4.3

(continued)

Table 1. (Continued) General background characteristics of respondents

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
8. Place where respondent's mother was raised	N=2487	N=115
Farm/ranch	26.7	44.3
Open country	10.7	16.5
Small town	23.0	20.0
City, 10,000-49,999	29.3	12.2
Metro	10.2	7.0
9. Parent's current residence	N=2518	N=117
Farm	24.6	56.4
Non-farm	75.4	43.6
10. Parents' farming status	N= 907	N= 73
Full-time farmers	33.3	39.7
Part-time farmers	48.4	42.5
Non-farmers	18.3	17.8
11. Parents' average yearly income	N=2215	N=107
Less than $10,000	10.0	17.7
$10,000 to $14,999	16.4	25.2
$15,000 to $19,999	16.4	18.7
$20,000 to $49,999	47.8	13.1
$50,000 and over	9.4	9.3
12. Father's educational attainment	N=2491	N=115
Less than 12 yrs.	12.2	29.5
High School graduate	21.4	30.4
Post-secondary training	21.8	20.0
College graduate	25.9	13.0
Graduate work	18.7	7.0
13. Mother's educational attainment	N=2477	N=116
Less than 12 yrs.	8.2	17.2
High School graduate	33.2	40.5
Post-secondary training	28.8	24.1
College graduate	21.4	8.6
Graduate work	7.6	9.5
14. Respondent's political orientation	N=2416	N=103
Conservative	31.5	23.3
Moderate	40.3	55.3*
Liberal	28.2	21.4

(continued)

*Includes don't know.

Table 1. (Continued) General background characteristics of respondents

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
15. Father's politica orientation	N=2384	N= 96
Conservative	56.0	51.0
Moderate	37.0	39.6*
Liberal	7.0	9.4
16. Mother's political orientation	N=2397	N= 96
Conservative	50.6	39.6
Moderate	40.6	47.9*
Liberal	8.8	12.5

*Includes don't know.

Table 2. High School background characteristics of respondents (Percentages).

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
1. High School GPA	N=2535	N=110
A	27.4	17.2
B	54.1	60.3
C or below	18.5	22.5
2. Were agriculture courses offered in respondent's high school?	N=2505	N=115
Yes	47.6	66.1
No	48.3	33.9
3. Did respondent take any agriculture courses in high school?	N=2493	N=116
Yes	23.2	45.7
No	76.8	54.3
4. Were home economics courses offered in respondent's high school?	N=2494	N=114
Yes	90.3	97.4
No	7.6	2.6
5. Did respondent take any home economics courses in high school?	N=2488	N=115
Yes	17.6	20.0
No	82.4	80.0
6. Did one course in high school, more than any other course, influence respondent's decision to major in agriculture or home economics?	N=2531	N=117
Yes	23.6	30.8
No	76.4	69.2
7. If "yes", was this course in	N= 579	N= 36
Agriculture	36.1	86.1
Home Economics	-	-
Biological Sciences	54.8	8.3
Physical Science	-	-
Other	9.1	5.6

(continued)

Table 2. (Continued) High School background characteristics of respondents

	All 1862 Schools		Murray State University	
8. High school activities in which respondent participated				
Athletic teams	N=2459	40.9	N=110	56.4
Intramurals	N=2147	40.4	N= 97	43.3
Cheerleading	N=2053	17.9	N= 92	33.7
Debate, Drama, Chorus, Band	N=2100	34.2	N= 93	30.1
Hobby clubs	N=2067	21.2	N= 87	17.2
Honorary clubs	N=2160	33.3	N= 92	2[illegible].2
Newspaper/yearbook	N=2125	20.4	N= 93	20.4
Subject matter clubs	N=2157	36.7	N= 91	27.5
Student Government	N=2167	20.3	N= 96	17.7
4-H	N=2049	12.0	N= 89	20.2
FFA	N=2071	9.0	N= 97	16.5
FHA	N=1937	3.9	N= 81	8.2
Other Vocational clubs	N=2004	10.5	N= 93	12.9

Table 3. Agricultural and non-agricultural work experiences of respondents (Percentages).

	All 1862 Schools		Murray State University	
Type of work-experience				
Farms or ranch work on home farm	N=2303	47.0	N=111	73.9
Farm or ranch work elsewhere as a hired employee	N=2285	47.2	N=110	70.0
Other agriculture-related work	N=2263	58.2	N=110	34.5
Home economics related work as a hired employee	N=2089	5.1	N= 99	6.1
Other work experiences	N=2381	88.2	N=109	81.7

Table 4. People deemed "very influential" or of "some influence" in helping respondent to choose his/her college Major. (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools				Murray State University			
		Very Influential	+ Some Influence	= Total Influence		Very Influential	+ Some Influence	= Total Influence
Mother	N=2487	13.7	47.2	60.4	N=112	15.2	50.0	65.2
Father	N=2475	21.9	43.6	65.5	N=112	22.3	48.2	60.5
Brother	N=2292	5.6	16.1	21.7	N=102	6.9	28.4	35.3
Sister	N=2320	2.0	14.5	16.5	N=105	3.8	23.8	27.6
Other relative	N=2426	7.5	21.4	28.9	N=108	5.6	24.1	29.7
High School friend	N=2425	4.7	20.4	25.1	N=108	4.6	25.9	30.5
High School counselor	N=2419	2.6	13.6	16.2	N=107	3.7	13.1	16.8
County Extension Agent	N=2410	2.3	7.6	9.9	N=109	7.3	11.9	19.2
Vocational Ag. teacher	N=2404	6.5	8.4	14.9	N=108	18.5	16.7	35.2
Home Economics teacher	N=2380	0.5	1.9	2.4	N=106	0.0	0.9	0.9
Other teacher or principal	N=2400	5.7	16.1	21.8	N=106	3.8	17.0	20.8
College friend	N=2422	10.1	24.4	34.5	N=106	6.6	30.2	36.8
College teacher or advisor	N=2414	12.4	24.1	36.5	N=108	16.7	26.9	43.6
Former student	N=2403	6.7	15.4	22.1	N=106	6.6	21.7	28.3
Dean or Associate Dean of Ag. or Home economics	N=2396	3.3	8.6	11.9	N=104	1.0	5.8	6.8
Veterinarian	N=2417	8.9	12.9	21.8	N=105	7.6	15.2	22.8
Clergyman	N=2398	1.0	4.8	5.8	N=105	1.0	2.9	3.9

Table 5. Things deemed of "very important" or "some importance" in choosing respondent's present major. (Percentages)

Things Deemed Important	All 1862 Schools				Murray State University			
		Very Important	+ Some Importance	= Total Importance		Very Important	+ Some Importance	= Total Importance
Scholarship and/or financial assistance	N=2398	6.6	10.6	17.2	N=105	5.7	17.1	22.8
To prepare for a career	N=2430	72.5	22.1	94.6	N=109	75.2	16.5	91.7
To help others	N=2403	27.1	45.3	72.4	N=108	27.8	39.8	67.6
A preference of country life to city life	N=2410	47.4	29.3	76.9	N=108	63.0	24.1	87.1
Successful prior experience in agriculture	N=2386	23.3	25.2	48.5	N=105	41.9	31.4	73.3
Successful prior experience in home economics	N=2352	0.7	3.2	3.9	N=103	0.0	3.9	3.9
My friends were in this major	N=2391	2.6	13.9	16.7	N=104	3.8	25.0	28.8
My family thought it would be best	N=2397	2.4	17.6	20.0	N=106	2.8	33.0	35.8
High school teacher or advisor suggested it	N=2390	2.4	9.0	11.4	N=107	3.7	15.0	18.7
College teacher or advisor suggested it	N=2377	4.7	15.2	19.9	N=103	4.9	18.4	23.3
Had a course related to this in high school	N=2377	5.8	13.4	19.2	N=106	17.9	17.9	35.8
Had a course related to this in college	N=2379	11.9	19.5	3.4	N=106	13.2	20.8	34.0
Chance to make better grades	N=2365	2.8	13.6	16.4	N=107	5.6	24.3	29.9
It would insure a good income	N=2381	15.1	41.7	56.8	N=106	20.8	45.3	66.1
Other	N=1220	42.7	3.8	46.5	N= 52	57.7	0.0	57.7

Table 6. Membership in agriculture or home economics related organizations while at college. (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools		Murray State University	
Department clubs	N=2309	39.8	N=100	38.9
Judging teams	N=2269	12.8	N=103	24.3
Honor fraternities/sororities	N=2255	17.1	N=101	9.9
College 4-H/FFA/FHA	N=2336	9.4	N=100	17.0
Student agriculture or Home economics council	N=2229	5.8	N= 99	9.1
Social fraternities/sororities	N=2267	15.6	N= 99	25.3
Professional societies/associations	N=2267	20.3	N=100	15.0

Table 7. Position as a leader or officer in agriculture or home economics related organizations while in college. (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools		Murray State University	
Departmental clubs	N= 714	33.3	N= 34	47.1
Judging teams	N= 217	50.7	N= 18	38.9
Honors fraternities/sororities	N= 284	22.9	N= 8	25.0
College 4-H/FFA/FHA	N= 156	55.1	N= 17	82.4
Student agriculture or Home economics council	N= 100	40.0	N= 6	66.7
Social fraternities/sororities	N= 291	61.9	N= 24	75.0
Professional societies/associations	N=344	26.2	N= 14	57.1

Table 8. Sources of funds for college education (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools		Murray State University	
Scholarships	N=2331	26.7	N=105	41.9
Student loans or grants	N=2318	24.8	N=105	41.9
Own savings	N=2370	75.5	N=108	83.3
Part-time work while at college	N=2356	54.7	N=109	60.6
Parents	N=2412	84.5	N=106	71.7
Veterans benefits	N=2298	8.0	N=102	16.7
Spouse	N=2288	10.6	N=100	10.0
Other relative or friends	N=2291	9.9	N=101	18.9
Summer job	N=2373	78.2	N=109	79.8
Other	N=1369	13.4	N= 60	21.7

Table 9. Educational aspirations (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
1. Educational goal	N=2448	N=115
Quit school before bachelor's degree	2.5	4.4
Complete work for a bachelor's degree	31.7	22.8
Complete program for a master's degree	27.2	35.1
Professional degree	21.2	21.1
Complete program for a doctoral degree	17.4	16.7
2. For those expecting to do graduate work		
Percent expecting to remain in an agriculture or home economics related concentration	N=1260 82.5	N= 77 96.1
Percent expecting to remain at their present university	N=1227 57.7	N= 74 51.4

Table 10. Educational expectations (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
	N=2443	N=113
Quit school before bachelor's degree	2.9	8.0
Complete work for a bachelor's degree	57.1	43.4
Complete program for a master's degree	21.7	35.4
Professional degree	13.3	13.3
Complete program for a doctoral degree	5.0	0.0

Table 11. Farming plans and residential preference (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
1. Expectation of inheriting a farm or ranch	N=2492	N=115
Definitely expect to	15.9	24.3
Some possibility of it	31.5	33.9
Definitely won't	51.8	40.9
Already inherited one	0.7	0.9
2. Expectation of owning a farm or ranch	N=2472	N=112
Yes, own alone	29.4	70.5
Yes, own with others	17.9	13.4
No	52.7	16.1
3. Residential preference	N=2497	N=115
Farm/ranch	37.9	59.1
Open country	20.1	11.3
Small town (under 10,000)	9.7	8.7
City, 10,000-49,999	16.9	15.7
Metro	15.5	5.2

Table 12. Income expectation on respondents' first job (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
	N=2384	N=111
Under $10,000	36.7	38.8
$10,000 - 14,999	51.7	50.4
$15,000 - 19,999	7.6	6.3
$20,000 and over	4.0	5.4

Table 13. Selected attitudes of respondents on Women's Issues. (Percent "strongly agreeing" or "agreeing".)

	All 1862 Schools				Murray State University			
		Strongly Agree	+ Agree =	Total Agreement		Strongly Agree	+ Agree =	Total Agreement
1. Women in college are more concerned with getting a husband than with preparing for a career.	N=2487	2.9	17.3	20.2	N=115	2.6	13.9	16.5
2. The husband and wife should be equal partners in the marriage.	N=2498	53.4	36.8	90.2	N=115	51.3	33.9	85.2
3. It is alright for a woman to work but her real fulfillment in life comes with motherhood.	N=2489	10.7	22.9	33.6	N=115	16.5	31.3	47.8
4. A woman who does the same work as a man should receive the same pay.	N=2502	59.6	35.9	95.5	N=115	50.4	45.2	95.6
5. I would feel uncomfortable if my supervisor at work were a woman.	N=2502	5.6	12.0	17.6	N=115	5.2	13.0	18.2
6. Women are capable of performing as well as men at work outside the home.	N=2488	23.4	37.6	61.0	N=114	21.9	31.6	53.5
7. It's alright for women to work full-time even though their children are in school.	N=2499	12.2	37.7	49.9	N=115	11.3	34.8	46.1
8. Most agricultural occupations are unsuited for women.	N=2500	3.4	20.1	23.5	N=115	5.2	20.9	26.1
9. Women should work full-time only before they have children.	N=2490	6.1	19.6	25.7	N=114	8.8	15.8	24.6

Table 14. Selected attitudes of respondents on ecological issues. (Percent "strongly agreeing" or "agreeing.")

	All 1862 Schools				Murray State University			
		Strongly Agree	+ Agree	= Total Agreement		Strongly Agree	+ Agree	= Total Agreement
1. The government should be able to force farmers to adopt soil conservation practices if they have erosion problems.	N=2487	15.0	33.3	48.3	N=115	17.4	29.6	47.0
2. Greater regulation is needed on the use of chemicals in agriculture.	N=2490	20.6	36.4	57.0	N=115	17.4	40.0	57.4
3. Economic progress that results in the destruction of places of natural beauty needs to be stopped.	N=2490	35.3	39.2	74.5	N=114	32.5	36.0	68.5
4. Strip mining coal to provide energy for our country is more important than keeping the countryside in its natural condition.	N=2480	2.1	12.3	14.4	N=115	4.3	11.3	15.6

Table 15. Respondents' perception about the field of agriculture (Percentages).

	All 1862 Schools				Murray State University			
		Strongly Agree	+ Agree	= Total Agreement		Strongly Agree	+ Agree	= Total Agreement
1. There are good career opportunities in agriculture.	N=2497	40.4	46.5	86.9	N=114	46.5	44.7	91.2
2. Most work in agriculture can be done by people with little education.	N=2496	1.2	11.7	13.9	N=115	2.6	9.6	12.2
3. Agriculture is a declining industry.	N=2497	3.0	5.1	8.1	N=115	3.5	3.5	7.0

Table 16. Respondents' perception about agriculture students (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
1. Agriculture students are sure of what they want to do in life	N=2435	N=114
More than non-ag. students	42.5	55.8
Same as non-ag. students	55.0	43.4
Less than non-ag. students	2.5	0.9
2. Agriculture students are interested in competing for high grades	N=2438	N=111
More than non-ag. students	7.1	6.2
Same as non-ag. students	73.8	71.9
Less than non-ag. students	19.2	21.9
3. Agriculture students are interested in classical music and good literature	N=2418	N=114
More than non-ag. students	2.9	3.5
Same as non-ag. students	46.9	42.1
Less than non-ag. students	50.2	54.4
4. Agriculture students are friendly and helpful to other people	N=2431	N=113
More than non-ag. students	55.0	67.3
Same as non-ag. students	43.2	31.0
Less than non-ag. students	1.8	1.7
5. Agriculture students are willing to accept new and unusal ideas	N=2420	N=113
More than non-ag. students	16.0	24.8
Same as non-ag. students	66.7	62.8
Less than non-ag. students	17.3	12.4

(continued)

Table 16. (Continued) Respondents' perception about agriculture students (Percentages)

	All 1862 Schools	Murray State University
6. Agriculture students are interested in making alot of money	N=2432	N=112
More than non-ag. students	5.7	10.7
Same as non-ag. students	69.7	77.7
Less than non-ag. students	24.6	11.6
7. Agriculture students are tolerant of people who come from a different background	N=2432	N=113
More than non-ag. students	19.8	25.7
Same as non-ag. students	59.2	56.6
Less than non-ag. students	21.0	17.7
8. Agriculture students are seriously concerned about the state of the nation and of the world	N=2440	N=114
More than non-ag. students	29.1	34.2
Same as non-ag. students	62.1	56.1
Less than non-ag. students	8.8	9.7
9. Agriculture students are interested in having a good time at college	N=2432	N=114
More than non-ag. students	10.9	8.8
Same as non-ag. students	81.6	85.1
Less than non-ag. students	7.5	6.1